



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Journal of the Society of Arts.

FRIDAY, JUNE 11, 1858.

SEVENTH ANNUAL CONFERENCE.

The Institutions in Union are requested to take notice that the Seventh Annual Conference between the Representatives of the Institutions in Union and the Council, will be held on Thursday, the 24th of June, at 10 o'clock in the morning. C. Wentworth Dilke, Esq., Chairman of the Council, will preside. Institutions are requested to forward, as soon as possible, to the Secretary of the Society of Arts, the name of the representative appointed to attend the Conference.

The Chairmen of, or Representatives from, the several Local Boards of Examiners, are invited to attend the Conference, as matters connected with the arrangements for the next year's Examinations will, amongst other subjects, be brought under consideration.

ANNUAL DINNER.

The One hundred and fourth Anniversary Dinner of the Society will take place at St. James's Hall, Piccadilly, on Thursday, the 24th instant, at half past five for six o'clock punctually. Members and their friends are requested to take notice that tickets (price 10s. 6d. each) may be had at the Society's House, on and after Wednesday next, the 16th instant.

CONVERSAZIONE AT SOUTH KENSINGTON.

The following letter has been addressed by the Council of the Society of Arts to the Lords of the Committee of Council on Education :—

Society of Arts, Manufactures, and Commerce,
Adelphi, London, W.C., June 9th, 1858.

MY LORDS,—I am directed by the Council of the Society of Arts to thank your Lordships for the advantage which the Society enjoyed in holding its *Conversazione*, by your permission, in the Museum at South Kensington, on Saturday, the 8th ult.

The *Conversazione* was attended by more than 2,280 persons, principally members of the Society and of Institutions in union with it.

The requisite arrangements were skilfully made by your officers; the whole of the building was opened to the visitors; and the collections, which were examined with much interest, were generally and very highly appreciated.

In making this communication to your Lordships, the Council cannot confine themselves to an expression of thanks for the advantages which the Society enjoyed on the particular occasion referred to. The Council avail themselves of this opportunity to record how highly, on public grounds, and in the interests of "Arts, Manufactures, and Commerce," the Society appreciates the wise liberality which has characterised the regulations

laid down by the Committee of Council in respect of the public uses of the Museum at South Kensington.

It is open, on certain evenings of each week, to the general public, free of charge; and on certain other evenings of each week it may be visited by Societies which promote Art, Science, or Education.

The creation and maintenance of museums and similar establishments, at the expense of the public, can only be justified when they are open as fully and freely as possible to the use of the public; and there are large masses of persons, quite capable of profiting by visits to museums, who are practically debarred from using them if they are closed during the evening. Your Lordships are aware that immense numbers of persons have used the privilege of visiting the Museum at South Kensington of an evening, and the Council of the Society of Arts cannot but express its earnest hope that the success of the great experiment which your Lordships have tried, may lead to the adoption of the same wise liberality in other departments.

I have the honour to be, my Lords,
Your Lordships' most obedient servant,
P. LE NEVE FOSTER, Secretary.

BRITISH HONDURAS.

The following communication has been received from the Honourable R. Temple, Chief Justice of British Honduras :—

As the importance of British Honduras becomes more recognised—as, in a commercial point of view, its value becomes more appreciated, the more desirable is it that all doubts as to its being a dominion of the British Crown should be removed. There has been much misapprehension upon this subject, owing to an ignorance of many of its real features. All the disputes which have arisen with our Transatlantic friends, within the last six or seven years, respecting our tenure of Honduras, have been grounded upon the assumption, on the part of the American writers and statesmen, that the treaties of 1783 and 1786, between Great Britain and Spain, remained unrescinded, although neglected, but were like some law which for a number of years had fallen into desuetude, but which might at any time be drawn from its dark and dusty corner, and, like the dry bones of the Prophet's vision, be made to assume its original vitality and vigour. Upon this assumption the argument, on the American side, has hitherto been based. I trust that I shall be able to prove very satisfactorily that nothing can be more erroneous than such a supposition.

I wish to speak with the greatest respect of the United States as a nation. I wish most carefully to avoid using a single expression calculated to cause any angry feelings in the minds of the energetic, enterprising, courageous, intellectual, but somewhat irritable people of that country, but I cannot refrain from charging them with a meddling disposition and an arrogant spirit, in presuming to dictate to the British Government as to what are and what are not the rights of the British Crown with respect to territories to which they themselves cannot have the slightest pretensions. What is it to them whether we have or have not any territorial rights in British Honduras? That is a question to be discussed, if discussed at all, with Spain, and not with the United States. Even assuming it to be a fact (and it is very far from being so) that Mexico and the Central American States succeeded to all the rights which Old Spain formerly possessed, still, the United States could not, with any show of reason, upon this ground, pretend to dispute our sovereignty in Honduras, for the question would then be between Great Britain and those States. As well might the United States dispute our right to Jamaica, or question our claims to New Zealand and Australia. "But (says Mr. Buchanan) Mr. Monroe, when President of the United States, had, in 1823, announced, in a public message to Congress,

that the American continents were not henceforth to be considered subject to colonization by European Powers." Who constituted Mr. Monroe the lawgiver of nations,—the Lycurgus of the world? What does it signify to us what doctrine Mr. Monroe chose to lay down in his presidential address to Congress? Other countries were not bound by it. Suppose Mr. Monroe had added, "Neither shall the islands in the Caribbean Sea be subject any longer to European sway. Cuba shall be released from the yoke of Spain, and Great Britain shall be relieved from the burthen of governing Trinidad and Jamaica." Such language would certainly be very ridiculous, but it would be in accordance with the principle of his doctrine. If the President of the United States is empowered to lay down, when addressing Congress, territorial doctrines unknown to Vattel, unmentioned by Grotius, the same liberty cannot be denied to the Queen of Great Britain, and she might with equal propriety lay down the rule in her next speech to Parliament that the United States shall not be permitted to trade with China, shall not be allowed to have any commercial intercourse with India, that Japan shall be a sealed book, and the Philippine Islands forbidden ground. Such a determination on the part of our Most Gracious Queen, addressed to the British Parliament, would be quite as rational as that which was announced by Mr. Monroe to the American Congress.

But notwithstanding this arrogant annunciation, which was quoted by Mr. Buchanan for the purpose of inducing the British Government to abandon the territories of the crown in the Bay of Honduras, it is satisfactory to observe that it received no craven and pusillanimous response from the power to which it was addressed. Lord Clarendon, with that dignified firmness which belongs to him, in his letter to Mr. Crampton, dated May 27th, 1853, says:—"But Great Britain has nowhere in the treaty of April, 1850, renounced, nor ever had any intention to renounce, the full and absolute right which she possesses over her own lawful territories in Central America."

Mr. Buchanan says, "It would be a vain labour to trace the history of the connection of Great Britain with the Mosquito shore and other portions of Central America, previous to her treaties with Spain of 1783 and 1786." This is a mistake. There is no difficulty whatever in tracing the occupations of the British in the Bay of Honduras to their origin, and this I will now proceed to do. But I would first rectify an error which all American politicians and diplomatists commit, when speaking and writing on this subject. They represent British Honduras as being in Central America. It is no such thing. Previously to the revolt of the several States which now come under that denomination, the term "Central America" was unknown. The whole of the country which is now split into the petty States of Guatemala, Honduras, San Salvador, and Costa Rica, was called the Kingdom of Guatemala, which stretched as far in a northerly direction as the Hondo, and some writers assert, and those Americans, that it went even beyond that river. It comprised Vera Paz and Chiapas. But in 1821 the whole of the country between the Sarstoon and the Hondo had been for many years in the undisputed and peaceable possession of the English, and had long ceased to be considered as a portion of Guatemala. The term Central America, therefore, being applied only to the states which at that time asserted their independence, excluding Guatemala as it then existed, and so much of it as was under the dominion of Spain,—British Honduras cannot with propriety be said to be a part of it.

It can be clearly proved that during the Commonwealth, in the year 1653, the English logwood cutters had succeeded in firmly establishing themselves in the whole of the country between the Siban and the Hondo, and had also occupied all the islands in the Bay of Honduras, including what are now called the Bay Islands.

That they had many a hard tussle for these possessions with the few inhabitants who were scattered over the uncleared tracts between the limits above mentioned, and that much unjustifiable violence, and many deeds of rapine and savage cruelty were committed, there is little doubt; but that they succeeded in firmly planting themselves on the soil there is as little. The Spaniards made many ineffectual attempts to remove them. But the Spaniards, in the reign of Phillip IV. were not like those in the time of Charles I. They were not like those indomitable spirits who followed Cortez and Pizarro through difficulties and dangers, and performed feats of daring, the narrative of which is more like the romantic account of the wondrous deeds of Orlando, the heroic actions of Godfrey, and the valorous achievements of the Cid, than authentic history. They differed as much from them as the effeminate Romans of the latter days of the Empire, who became the easy spoil of the wild hordes of Attila and Alaric, differed from the invincible cohorts of Scipio, or the impregnable legions of Cæsar,—or the dastardly Greeks of the present day from those who fought at Salamis and Platea. It is an old saying, "What cannot be cured must be endured." Whether Charles II., the successor of Phillip, had ever heard this apothegm, I cannot say, but he certainly acted in the spirit of it, for in the year 1760 he concluded a treaty with Great Britain, the 7th article of which is as follows:—

"All offences, damages, losses, injuries, which the nations and the people of Great Britain and Spain have at any time heretofore, upon any cause or pretext whatsoever, suffered by each other in America, shall be expunged out of remembrance, and buried in oblivion, as if no such thing had ever passed.

"Moreover, it is agreed that the Most Serene King of Great Britain, his heirs and successors, shall have, hold, keep, and enjoy for ever, with plenary right of sovereignty, dominion, possession, and propriety, all those lands, regions, islands, colonies, and places whatsoever, being, or situated in, the West Indies, or in any part of America, which the said King of Great Britain and his subjects do at present hold and possess, so as that in regard thereof, or upon any colour or pretence whatsoever, nothing more may, or ought to be urged, nor any question or controversy be even moved, concerning the same hereafter."

Had this treaty been undisturbed, I presume no question could ever have arisen respecting our right to British Honduras, the Bay Islands, and the Mosquito shore. But in 1783 and 1786, Mr. Pitt being First Lord of the Treasury in the latter year, with a most short-sighted policy we agreed to treaties which extinguished our sovereignty over territories which had been solemnly sanctioned by the crown of Spain.

In a long statement made by Mr. Buchanan, in reply to Lord Clarendon, dated July 22, 1854, the following observations are contained:—

"The British statement claims the territory between the Siban and the Sarstoon by right of conquest, and observes, that the treaty of 1786 was put an end to by a subsequent state of war with Spain, and during that war the boundaries of the British settlement in question were enlarged; and that the subsequent treaty of peace not having revived the treaties of 1783 and 1786, Great Britain is entitled to retain this territory.

"It may be observed that the statement does not mention at what period the boundaries of the British settlements were enlarged. If this took place, as it is believed it did, after the date of the treaty of alliance between Great Britain and Spain in 1809, which terminated the war, then this argument falls to the ground. If before 1809, Great Britain, when concluding this treaty, ought to have informed Spain that she intended to convert the encroachments of the settlers in Belize on Spanish territory into an absolute right. That she did not then intend to pursue such a course towards an ally in distress, is clear from her subsequent conduct.

"In 1814, Great Britain revived all her pre-existing

commercial treaties with Spain; and what is the privilege granted to her by the treaty of 1786, of cutting mahogany, logwood, and other dyewoods on Spanish territory, thus enabling her to extend British commerce in those articles, but a commercial privilege?

"So far from the treaty of 1786 being put an end to by the war, its continued existence in 1817 and 1819 was recognised by the Acts of the British Parliament. These declare, in so many words, that 'Belize was not within the territory and dominion of his Majesty,' but was merely 'a settlement for certain purposes, in the possession and under the protection of his Majesty.'

"For the nature of this 'settlement' and a knowledge of these 'certain purposes,' we can refer nowhere except to the treaties of 1783 and 1786.

"In addition to these Acts of Parliament, it is proper here to report, that so late as 1826 Great Britain has, by her treaty with Mexico, acknowledged the continued existence and binding force of the treaty of 1786."

These arguments against the territorial rights of the British Crown in Honduras I shall now humbly endeavour to answer.

It is freely admitted that, whatever might have been the rights of the British Crown previously to the treaties of 1783 and 1786, under those treaties the subjects of his Britannic Majesty had a qualified occupation of Honduras. The treaties gave to them limited privileges, and were most careful in avoiding any expression which could be construed into a grant of territory. It is most freely admitted there, that under the treaties in question, we can have no claim beyond those privileges, the exercise of which was to be confined within certain specified limits. I have already expressed my surprise and regret that the government should have been so impolitic and shortsighted, considering the vantage ground which they held, as to have agreed to those treaties, but of this I am convinced, that however wrong they might have been, as regarded the interests of Great Britain in the course which they adopted, they acted with perfect good faith towards Spain. It is more than doubtful whether Spain acted in a similar spirit towards Great Britain; but, let the intentions of the former power have been what they might, this fact is certain,—we strictly observed the provisions of the treaties. Spain did not. One of the stipulations of the treaty of 1786 was, that the English should evacuate the Mosquito shore. They did evacuate it. One article prohibited the building of any fort. No fortification of any sort was constructed. Another forbade the cultivation of the soil for the purpose of exporting its produce. No cultivation was attempted. Another confined all wood-cutting operations between the Hondo and the Sibán. Beyond those rivers the cutters did not go. In short, there was not a single particle of the treaties which the English settlers did not religiously observe. And how did the subjects of His Most Catholic Majesty conduct themselves in reference to them? It is a notorious fact, that the English were constantly liable to the attacks of the Spaniards, who sought every opportunity to disturb them in their peaceful occupations, in the hope that, harassed, worn, vexed, tired out, they might be induced to abandon a country where they had no quiet, where they could not sleep in safety, where they must constantly have their loins girded, and where the fruits of their labour were every hour liable to be stolen or destroyed. In the year 1798, the Spaniards, headed by General O'Neill, the Captain-General of Yucatan, made a grand attack upon the British, but were repulsed with great loss. Notwithstanding that war was declared between Great Britain and Spain in 1796, the settlers did not take advantage of that circumstance to improve their condition, but continued peaceably to follow their cutting operations, and faithfully to observe the treaties. But after the "affair" of '98, there was an end of all treaties—and it was high time. Now, it is a maxim of international law, of universal acceptance, and I think

that our American friends will not repudiate it, that a declaration of war between two countries operates at once as an entire abrogation of all treaties previously existing between them, and that those treaties do not necessarily start again into existence when the war ceases, as naturally as Castor rises when Pollux sets, but that they must be, if it be deemed advisable, specially revived by an express treaty to that effect. In 1783, the Spanish Crown, by a treaty signed at Versailles, granted to the subjects of the King of Great Britain the right to cut logwood in Honduras, under certain restrictions and within particular limits. The convention between Great Britain and Spain, signed in London in 1786, extended those limits, and gave permission to British settlers to cut mahogany as well as logwood. In 1796, war was declared between Great Britain and Spain, and the treaties of 1783 and 1786 were thereby abrogated and annulled. The Spanish Government acted upon this principle, and were perfectly right in so doing. But the subjects of Spain—whether at the suggestion of their government or not I am not prepared to say—had never acted with good faith in respect to the treaties; they had constantly carried on a guerilla war against the subjects of his Britannic Majesty. Now, however, that the treaties had ceased to exist, and they were not bound by any political obligation to respect the persons and property of the English, they were quite justified in compelling them to evacuate the country, if they were able to do so. The Spanish Government, therefore, gave orders to General O'Neill, the Captain-General of Yucatan, to dispossess the English of the lands which they held under the treaties, and drive them out of the country. This officer, as I have before stated, made a vigorous attempt to carry the orders of his government into execution, but he met with a determined and successful resistance, and the British settlers maintained possession of the country which they had previously held, subject to the restrictive provisions of the treaties. But they not only maintained possession of the country, they ceased to regard that possession as a permissive one, and treated it as an absolute possession, founded upon the complete, unqualified ownership of the soil. But this was not all. Considering, as they were justified in doing, that all treaties between Great Britain and Spain were abrogated by the war, and more especially those affecting themselves, which the Spaniards, never faithfully observing, had been the first, by their attack under O'Neill, to declare void, and perceiving that the whole of the country to the south of the Sibán (the boundary line of the Convention of 1786) as far as the Sarstoon, was vacant and unoccupied, they took possession of that part which was densely covered with the primæval forest, on which there was not a single habitation, where, perhaps, human foot had never trod before, and where the scream of the vulture, the howl of the jaguar, and the roar of the cataract as it rushed down the mountain steep, were the only sounds which fell upon the ear. Since that period, the occupation, which then commenced, until the present day, has been continuous. It has never ceased for one moment, and it has never been once disturbed, protested against, or questioned by Spain. At the conclusion of the war between Great Britain and Spain, the treaties of 1783 and 1786 were not revived, nor were they brought into existence at any subsequent period. On the cessation of hostilities, a treaty was concluded between Great Britain and Spain, which was signed in London on the 14th of January, 1809. In this short treaty, which consists of only two articles, no mention whatever is made of the treaties of 1783 and 1786, nor, indeed, of any other treaties; but by an additional article signed in London on the 21st of March, in the same year, the two countries mutually agree to proceed to a regular negotiation of a treaty of commerce as soon as it shall be practicable so to do, affording in the meantime mutual facilities to the commerce of the subjects of each other, by temporary regulations founded on principles of reci-

procal utility. On the 5th of June, 1814, a treaty of commerce was concluded between Great Britain and Spain, in which no mention is made of the defunct treaties of 1783 and 1786. On the 24th of August, 1814, additional articles were signed at Madrid. The first article is as follows:—

"It is agreed that, pending the negotiations of a new treaty of commerce, Great Britain shall be admitted to trade with Spain upon the same conditions as those which existed previously to the year 1796, [or before the war broke out], all the treaties of commerce which at that period subsisted between the two nations being duly ratified and confirmed."

From the terms of this article it has been hastily and illegally concluded that the treaties of 1783 and 1786 were revived, but upon a careful consideration of the words, and an examination of the strict meaning of those words, it will, I think, be admitted that they will not bear that construction:—

"It is agreed that Great Britain shall be admitted to trade with Spain upon the same conditions as those which existed previously to the year 1796." Was it necessary to revive the two treaties of 1783 and 1786 to enable Great Britain to do that? Assuredly not; there is not one word in those treaties relating to the trade between Great Britain and Spain, and if there had been, only so much of the treaties would have been revived as stated the "conditions" of that trade. If then we were allowed to trade with Spain "upon the same conditions" as those which existed before the war, it was useless going to those treaties to ascertain the conditions, because they are not there stated, and only those treaties were revived which did state the conditions. No one who has read *Whateley* or *Watts* could come to any other conclusion. But the logic of those who draw a different inference is somewhat akin to that of the young gentleman who offered to prove to his astonished guardian that "an eel-pie was a pigeon." Neither does the article above quoted mention by name, or in the most distant manner allude to, the treaties in question. *Vattel* says, "As every power at war pretends to have right on its side, and this pretension is not liable to be judged by others, the state of things at the instant of the treaty is to be held legitimate, and any change to be made in it requires an express specification in the treaty, consequently all things not mentioned in the treaty are to remain as they were at the conclusion of the war." And again, "Preceding treaties, mentioned and confirmed in the last, make a part of it." Now, in the convention of 1814 no mention whatever is made of the treaties of 1783 and 1786. But the article above quoted says, "All the treaties of commerce which at that period subsisted between the two nations, being hereby certified and confirmed." Now, if the treaties of 1783 and 1786 were treaties of commerce, they are revived by those words. What is a treaty of commerce? It is an agreement, or contract, entered into between two countries, by which the subjects of each are to be permitted to trade with each other in those countries, or their dependencies, they being allowed to have reciprocal advantages. It differs from a political treaty, which is a contract, not relating to mutual trade and commerce, but to territorial limits and boundaries, or the acts and deeds which the governments themselves may or may not perform; and from a treaty defensive and offensive, which is a treaty of alliance, by which each country engages to assist the other with arms, if war should break out between either of them and some other power. It may be general, or it may have reference only to a particular war. Now, I assert that the treaties of 1783 and 1786 were not treaties of commerce. Not one word is mentioned in either of them respecting the mutual trade and commercial relations of the two countries. The revival of them would not have enabled Great Britain to trade with Spain, more than she could have done with-

out them; and over our commercial transactions with that country, since the convention of 1814, they have not exercised the slightest influence. But Mr. Buchanan contends that they are treaties of commerce, because, says he, "what is the privilege granted to her by the treaty of 1786, of cutting mahogany, logwood, and other dyewoods on the Spanish territory, thus enabling her to extend British commerce in these articles, but a commercial privilege?" This argument belongs to the class of those which prove that an eel-pie is a pigeon, that a cat has three tails, and the like absurdities. One country by a treaty grants to the subjects of another country the use of a certain territory, by which use the grantees are enabled to carry on a particular kind of trade, not with the subjects of the granter, but with their fellow-subjects, *ergo*, that treaty is a treaty of commerce. So, if I leave to Mr. Buchanan for a term of years certain tan pits, by the use of which he is able to pursue his trade, and supply his customers with leather, I, by that leave, enter into a contract of trade with him. Nothing can be more ridiculous. A treaty of commerce is not a treaty granting certain privileges, by which the grantees are enabled to carry on a particular trade, but it is a treaty between two countries, by means of which the subjects of those countries may trade with each other in the articles peculiar to each country, in which commercial intercourse they receive facilities and advantages denied to the subjects of other countries not being parties to the treaty. That is a treaty of commerce. Neither the treaty of 1783 nor that of 1786 was such a treaty.

They are not styled *Treaties of Commerce*. That of 1783 is called "A Definitive Treaty between Great Britain and Spain," and that of 1786 "A Convention between Great Britain and Spain." The difference between a treaty and a convention I take to be this. A treaty is general and permanent, or intended to continue for a lengthened period. A convention relates to some particular object, or it is temporary, or provisional. The treaty of 1783 was a "treaty of peace," not a treaty of peace and commerce. But the one great and leading object of the treaty is made sufficiently manifest by the sixth article, which commences as follows:—

"The intention of the two high contracting parties being to prevent, as much as possible, all the causes of complaint and misunderstanding heretofore occasioned by the cutting of wood for dyeing, or logwood, and several English settlements having been formed and extended under that pretence upon the Spanish continent, it is expressly agreed that his Britannic Majesty's subjects shall have the right of cutting, loading, &c."

One great object of this treaty, then—which, no doubt, was a general treaty of peace—is obvious. The English had formed settlements upon the Spanish continent, in consequence of which disputes had arisen between them and the subjects of the crown of Spain, but, "to prevent, as much as possible, all causes of complaint and misunderstanding," the crown of Spain gives permission to the English to cut logwood within certain limits, and under certain restrictions. This, then, was the principal object of the treaty, not to enable the subjects of his Britannic Majesty to trade with the subjects of the Crown of Spain, but to prevent, by confining the British within certain limits, where they might be at liberty to cut logwood, "all causes of complaint and misunderstanding." Can this treaty, then, be correctly called a treaty of commerce? It is not stated that there was to be any trade with Spain. The logwood, when cut, was shipped to England, and there is no provision whatever that there should be any commercial intercourse of any kind between the subjects of the two crowns. On the contrary, the intention of the treaty seems to have been that all intercourse should cease, and, "to prevent complaints and misunderstandings," each should be confined within its own limits. Indeed, a little reflection will convince anyone that a treaty of commerce between the two nations would have been, under the circumstances, an

absurdity. When a treaty of commerce is agreed upon between two countries, it is supposed that each country produces articles which the other country does not produce, but which it requires. For instance, by the treaty between Great Britain and Portugal, in 1703, commonly called the "Treaty of Methuen," because it was negotiated by John Methuen, the British Ambassador Extraordinary in Portugal, it was agreed that the woollen manufactures of Great Britain should be admitted into Portugal as had been formerly accustomed, upon condition that wines of the growth of Portugal should be admitted into Great Britain on payment of two-thirds of the duty which was demanded for French wines. Ever since that period the English people have been poisoned by potations of heady Port, instead of being invigorated and enlivened by wholesome draughts of Bordeaux and Burgundy.

This was a treaty of commerce, and it is intelligible. But suppose a company of Englishmen were to settle in Portugal, and, like Noah, of blessed memory, plant vineyards, where would be the use of a treaty of commerce between them and the Portuguese?—they could only get Port in exchange for Port. In like manner, of what use was a treaty of commerce between the British settlers in Honduras and the Spaniards?—the former could only have supplied the latter with logwood, and of that article they had more than sufficient. Besides logwood, the only article in which the settlers dealt, would have been of no use to the Spaniards, because they had no manufacturers requiring the use of that dye. England was the only country at that time which made use of logwood, and England, therefore, was the only country which supplied a market to the cutters.

The treaty of 1783, then, was clearly not a treaty of commerce. Was that of 1786? This treaty is, in principle, the same as the former one. It extends the limits, and it grants permission to cut mahogany as well as logwood. It also stipulates for the performance of certain conditions, such as the evacuation of the Mosquito country, and the abstaining from erecting fortifications. But there is not a single word about trade, nor is there one expression from which we may gather that it was the intention of the contracting parties that the subjects of the two crowns should have any commercial intercourse with each other. But the 9th article of the treaty of 1783 affords the most convincing proof that that treaty was not considered—not intended to be—a treaty of commerce. It is as follows:—"Immediately after the exchange of the ratifications, the two high contracting parties shall name commissioners to treat concerning new arrangements of commerce between the two nations, on the basis of reciprocity and mutual commerce, which arrangements shall be settled and concluded within the space of two years, to be computed from the 1st of January, 1784."

From this article nothing can be clearer than that the treaty of 1783 was not itself considered, nor intended to be, a treaty of commerce, inasmuch as it agrees that commercial arrangements shall be entered into within the space of two years after the 1st of January, 1784. The commercial arrangements were *in futuro*, there were none *in presenti*.

The treaties of 1783 and 1786, then, were not treaties of commerce, and the convention of 1814, which confirmed all the treaties of commerce which had subsisted before the war, could not confirm them under that denomination. Did that Convention, then, confirm them specially? The definitive treaty of 1783 confirms a number of treaties, but it confirms by name, as the treaty of Westphalia, of Madrid, of Utrecht, of Baden, of Seville, of Aix-la-Chapelle, &c. The convention of 1814 never mentions nor alludes to them, and we have seen that, according to Vattel, "all things not mentioned in the treaty are to remain as they were at the conclusion of the war." Is there any other treaty which, it is pretended, revived those of 1783 and 1786? No! The

convention of 1814 is the only one which has been supposed to have exercised that resuscitating power.

Mr. Buchanan, in his statement to the Earl of Clarendon, dated January 6th, 1854, admits that the treaties of 1783 and 1786 were abrogated by the war, and that they had no existence, unless they had been revived by some subsequent treaty. He says:—"At what period, then, did Great Britain re-open her claims to the country of the Mosquitos, as well as to the continent in general? * * * * It certainly was not in 1814, when the commercial treaties which existed between the two powers, including, it is presumed, those of 1783 and 1786, were revived."

Mr. Buchanan admits that those treaties were not in existence unless they were revived, and that they were not revived by the convention of 1814 unless they were commercial treaties. I repeat that he admits this, for he says, "when the commercial treaties, including, I presume, those of 1783 and 1786, were revived."

Now, I think, I must have proved to the satisfaction of any reasonable person, that the treaties of 1783 and 1786 were not commercial treaties, and, therefore, that the convention of 1814, even in the opinion of Mr. Buchanan himself, did not revive them. Then they were never revived—then, they having been abrogated by the war, do not now exist, nor have they had any existence since the year 1796.

"When," says Mr. Buchanan, "did Great Britain renew her claim?" We claim ever since the year 1798, at which period we occupied, and have ever since continued to do so, the whole country between the Hondo and the Sarsteon, without any remonstrance from Spain, without expostulation or complaint of any kind.

Now I contend, and I believe I shall be borne out in my opinion by all writers on international law, that the British crown possesses a clear, substantial, indefeasible right to British Honduras, founded upon *usucaption* and *prescription*.

Vattel says, "Usucaption is the acquisition of domains founded on a long possession, uninterrupted, and undisputed, that is, on an acquisition solely proved by this possession. Prescription is the exclusion of all pretensions to a right founded on the length of time during which it has been neglected. * * Prescription being only founded on an absolute or lawful presumption, it has no place if the proprietor has not really neglected his rights. This condition implies three particulars:—1. That the proprietor cannot allege an invincible ignorance, either on his own part or that of his friends. 2. That he cannot justify his silence by lawful and solid reasons. 3. That he has neglected his right, or kept silence during a considerable number of years."

Now, let us see if these three conditions have been complied with. 1st. "That the proprietor cannot allege an invincible ignorance."

What is an invincible ignorance? It is not wilful ignorance, it is not an ignorance arising from forgetfulness and inattention,—but it is an ignorance which exists notwithstanding the most active and the most earnest endeavours to find out the truth. I will state the definition which the Roman Catholics give of invincible ignorance, which probably we may, as good Protestants, not be disinclined to adopt, inasmuch as it is borrowed from St. Augustine: "Catholic divines and the holy fathers, at the same time that they strictly insist on the necessity of adhering to the doctrine and communion of the Catholic Church, make an express exception of what is termed invincible ignorance, which occurs where persons out of the True Church are sincerely and firmly resolved, in spite of all worldly allurements, on the one hand, and of all opposition on the other, to enter into it if they can find it out, and when they use their best endeavours for this purpose." Now, taking this as a correct definition of invincible ignorance, and it is in this sense, in my opinion, that Vattel uses the expression, can Spain plead an invincible ignorance of the British possessions of Hon-

duras? Of the exercise of territorial rights on the part of the British Crown in Honduras? Of the commission of acts and deeds in Honduras expressly prohibited by the treaties of 1783 and 1786? Has she made every inquiry? Has she adopted every means within her power? Has she conscientiously, sincerely, and earnestly sought information? And, notwithstanding all her endeavours, has she been for the last sixty years in profound ignorance that Honduras was in the possession of the British Crown, and was treated by her as an absolute dominion? The supposition is too absurd. Pass we then on to the next condition.

2. "That he cannot justify his silence by lawful and solid reasons."

Assuming Spain to have been silent in respect to her supposed rights, what lawful and solid reasons can she allege to account for that silence? I am not aware of any reasons. Perhaps Mr. Buchanan may know of some; but until he publishes them to the world, I will assume that none exist, nor ever have existed.

3. "That he has neglected his right, or kept silence for a considerable number of years."

That Spain has done this, can, I think, be very clearly proved. The 4th article of the Convention of 1786, after stipulating that no fortification shall be erected, nor any body of troops posted, nor any piece of artillery kept at St. George's Key,* concludes as follows:—"And in order to verify with good faith the accomplishment of this condition *sine qua non* (which might be infringed by individuals, without the knowledge of the British Government), a Spanish officer or commissary, accompanied by an English officer or commissary, duly authorised, shall be admitted twice a-year, to examine into the real state of things."

At the end of the convention, there is the following declaration, signed by the Plenipotentiaries:—

"At the time of exchanging our Sovereign ratifications of this convention, signed the 14th of July last, we the undersigned Ministers Plenipotentiaries have agreed that the right of the English and Spanish commissaries, mentioned in the 4th article with respect to the island of Cago Casina, is to extend in like manner to all the other places, whether in the islands or on the continent, where the English cutters shall be situated. In witness, &c."

Up to the year 1796, a period of ten years, the Spanish commissaries made with the greatest regularity their half-yearly visits. Since that period, such a person as a Spanish commissary has never been seen at St. George's Bay, or in any part of British Honduras. The fact is undisputed, that for the last sixty years no commissary has been despatched from Spain. "Oh, but," says Mr. Buchanan, "the convention of 1814 revived all commercial treaties, and I suppose those of 1783 and 1786 were included." What Mr. Buchanan's supposition may be is a matter of little consequence; it was clearly not the supposition of Spain, or else why not send the Spanish commissary as agreed to by the latter treaty? But no commissary did she ever send. Here, then, is conclusive evidence, if Spain considered that her right to British Honduras still existed, that she neglected that right. But has Spain, by her representative at the Court of St. James's, ever remonstrated with the British government on the fact of that government treating Honduras as a dominion of the British Crown? Have they said, "You have sent soldiers, you have planted artillery, you have erected Courts of Justice, you have appointed a

Governor, who, although called a superintendent, is a Governor to all intents and purposes. Now, all these acts you must be aware are in direct violation of the express terms of the treaties, which, though abrogated by the war, were revived by the Convention of 1814. It is, therefore, my duty to inform you, that this state of things must be put an end to; it is not to be tolerated any longer. Those soldiers must be sent from the country; that artillery must be shipped off; those Courts of Justice must be dissolved; your House of Assembly must 'be no longer a Parliament,' as a distinguished personage of your country said on a memorable occasion, and your superintendent, as you choose to call him, and all other officers not authorised by the treaties, must be sent about their business." Has Spain, I say, by her representatives, ever spoken in this language? No, nor anything like it. On the contrary, she has always exhibited the most meek and lambl-like submission to our possession of the country; and it is my opinion that nothing would so much disconcert her as to say to her, "Honduras has been a bone of contention between America and us for sometime. We are tired of this dispute. Here, the country is yours: take it and keep it." It is not difficult to imagine what sort of a reply she would make to such a liberal offer. "Why, we can hardly keep Cuba out of the rapacious grasp of those filibustering Yankees;—Cuba, which contributes twenty millions of dollars a year to our exchequer; and do you wish us to be burdened with Honduras, that won't pay us a single cent? No, no, keep, keep it in Heaven's name."

It is quite evident, then, that our title to British Honduras by usucaption and prescription is an indefeasible one; that the conditions laid down by Vattel have been complied with. "1st. That the proprietor cannot allege an invincible ignorance. 2nd. That he cannot justify his silence by lawful and solid reasons. 3rd. That he has neglected his right, or kept silent for a considerable number of years." But the right of Great Britain to British Honduras has been recognized by various countries, by their sending consuls there, and demanding of the British exequaturs for those consuls. The United States sent a consul, Guatemala sent a consul, Spain sent a vice-consul, France sent a vice-consul, and there is a Mexican consul there at the present moment. But what does that signify? Mr. Buchanan is not frightened at that or any other difficulty. His gauntlet is always ready, and his trenchant blade glitters in the air, and he slashes away at what would terrify other people. He reminds me of the Frenchman's eulogistic song about General Jackson, in "Matthews's Trip to America:"—

"They come ten thousand strong,
But what was that to Jackson
He was always ready for action,
He beat them every one."

Mr. Buchanan would have been an admirable subject for the laudatory lyrics of the Gallic songster. "He is always ready for action, and, like Hotspur, in the way of bargain he will cavil on the ninth part of a hair." Hear what he says about the appointment of consuls. "The appointment of a consul recognises nothing more than the *de facto* possession of the post by the power from which his *exequatur* is received. Such an appointment does not in the slightest degree interfere with the question of the right *de jure* of this power to be in possession. This has ever been, and this must ever be, the law and practice of modern commercial nations. If it were otherwise, then, before the appointment of a consul, the government of a nation must first carefully inquire whether the party in possession be the rightful owner of the port, and if they determine against its right, then the commerce with it must cease altogether, or remain without consular protection. This would be a novel doctrine to maintain in the present age of commercial progress."

It would not be difficult to expose the fallacy of this reasoning, but I am spared the trouble of doing so, inas-

* St. George's Key is a small island, about nine miles from Belize. It was called by the Spaniards Casina, and sometimes Cago Casina. Casina signifies a farm-house or cottage, and Cago a rock or small islet in the sea. The sea, for upwards of 100 miles near the coast of Honduras is a complete archipelago, being covered with innumerable keys or islets. These give it the appearance rather of an enclosed lake than a part of the ocean.

much as it has been sufficiently answered by Mr. Clayton, another American statesman, of considerable learning and ability. That gentleman, in a letter addressed to Messrs. Gales and Seaton, Washington, dated January 7th, 1853, says, "The British title to the Central American States was recognised by Mr. Polk, in sending there Mr. Christopher Hempstead as consul, who remained in British Honduras, under the protection of the British flag, and in virtue of an exequatur obtained by Mr. Buchanan from the British Government, nearly three years, till I recalled him to prevent the possibility of any charge against General Taylor's administration of having recognised the English authority in Honduras."

Mr. Clayton speaks like an honest man. He says plainly and distinctly that Mr. Polk, the President of the United States, did recognise the British title by sending a consul to Honduras, and that when General Taylor became President, he recalled him, in order that he, General Taylor, should not be accused of recognising that title.

Mr. Clayton's letter to Mr. Hempstead, dated March 1st, 1850, is curious. He says, "As it is presumed that the appointment of a consul of the United States at Belize, even if required by our trade with that port, may have been made without full consideration of the territorial rights of Great Britain in that quarter, it is deemed advisable, under existing circumstances, to discontinue that consulate."

So the appointment of a consul at Belize was quite an accidental occurrence. It was not fully considered. Consuls had to be appointed at various places, and one at Belize was nominated by chance. This reminds me of the humorous observations made by Mr. Burke, in the course of his speech on the subsidiary treaty with the Landgrave of Hesse-Cassel. He said:—"That although the King of Prussia had professedly set out merely to obtain adequate satisfaction for the injury done his sister, his army, by accident, took Utrecht, possessed themselves of Amsterdam, restored the Stadtholder and the former government, and all this at a stroke, and, by the bye, which put him in mind of a verse in Cowley's sprightly ballad of the "Chronicle":—

'But when Isabella came,
Arm'd with a resistless flame,
And th' artillery of her eye,
Whilst she proudly march'd about,
Greater conquests to find out,
She beat out Susan—by the bye.'

And so, also, I suppose, Mr. Hempstead's appointment was made. It was, no doubt, true that Mr. Polk did not make that appointment; it was true that Mr. Buchanan applied to the British Government for his exequatur; and it was true that, for three long years, the flag of the Union fluttered in the breeze, before Mr. Hempstead's house, in all its stellular magnificence and glory, but all this was accidental, and, by-the-bye, "it was done without consideration." But the moment the subject was considered—the moment it was discovered what a *mauvais pas* Mr. Polk had made, an attempt was made to repair the mischief, and Mr. Hempstead was ordered, without loss of time, to pack up his stars and pocket his stripes.

But, assuming Mr. Buchanan's argument to be correct, namely, that the appointment of such an officer does not recognise the right, but only the fact of the governing power, why does he not now send a consul to Belize? In a letter published in the *New York Weekly Herald* of Dec. 12th, by whom written I have not the slightest idea, I find the following statement, of the correctness of which there can be no question. The writer, having spoken of Spain, France, and Mexico, says:—"All of these governments united have not half of the commercial transactions which the United States has with this settlement; and yet, with five vessels continually trading between here and the United States, with a vast amount of business, of great interest to the

United States, continually being transacted between the two places, the United States has no consul. Not only does the United States lose a portion of her revenue, but many of her citizens engaged in this trade are subjected to loss and imposition, for the want of a consul here, to assist masters in distress, and to protect American interests."

Honduras is supplied with provisions principally from Boston, New York, and New Orleans. Almost all the pork, flour, hams, cheeses, butter, lard, potatoes, and candles, come from those ports. Also, champagne, claret, and dried fruits. Likewise a large amount of iron wire of different descriptions. I ask again, then, why does not Mr. Buchanan send a consul to Belize, seeing that such a proceeding would not be a recognition of the British title? Because he knows that his argument is hollow,—that his reasoning is fallacious,—and that by sending a consul to Belize, he would acknowledge the right of Great Britain to British Honduras.

(To be continued.)

THE ATLANTIC TELEGRAPH.

The experimental expedition for trying in deep water the proposed operations for laying down the telegraphic cable between England and America, has completed its objects, and returned to the Sound on Thursday, 3rd inst., having been absent five days. The ships composing the squadron were the *Agamemnon*, the *Niagara*, the *Valorous*, and the *Gorgon*, and they left the Sound at about four o'clock on Saturday, May 29. The weather was extremely fine, and beyond the steady swell which always rolls off the western shores of Great Britain, the sea was perfectly calm, and both the sea and air promised to be in a very favourable condition for the prosecution of the experiments. When the squadron had reached the appointed rendezvous, a little north of Cape Ortegal, and about 120 miles north-west of the Port of Corunna, the whole of the ships lay to, and soundings were taken, which showed a depth of about 2,530 fathoms, or nearly three statute miles. The result of the soundings having been conveyed by signal to all the ships of the squadron, the *Agamemnon* and *Niagara* were backed close together, stern on, and a strong hawser passed between them to keep them in that situation. The end of the cable was then conveyed by boats from the *Niagara* to the *Agamemnon*, where the splice was safely made. The way in which the splice was made is stated to be effectual in neutralising the evil effects which it was supposed would result from the lay of the two portions of the cable being in opposite directions. A semicircular frame of strong wood was employed, some 15 feet long, and rather broad and thick towards the centre. In this deep grooves were cut, in which the cable was laid, each end passing in at the arms round two eyes in the centre of the crescent, and out at the sides, where the actual joining was made. By this method the strain of the splice was confined entirely to the ends inside the half-moon, while on the actual junction of the cable outside no tension of any kind could come. In order to keep the cable ends in their place around the blocks and within the grooves, a strip of boiler-plate of the same size as the wooden frame was bolted on to it, while to prevent the two portions of the cable untwisting, and to sink it rapidly, a heavy weight was attached to the centre. The splice having been effected, it was lowered overboard, and the two vessels payed out one mile of the experimental cable with the greatest ease. The dynamometer employed was found accurately to register the calculated strain on the cable at different depths. The engineer in charge of the brakes stands facing the graduated scale, and throws off the weights as he sees the vessel lurch and the strain upon the cable rising in proportion, while on the contrary, when the dynamometer indicates the tension at a low standard, and the cable running away

too quickly, the brakes are suffered to close again with ease. It was determined to try the effect of hauling the cable in again from different depths. The hauling-in gear and engine were put in action, and half a mile of the cable recovered with the greatest ease. A further experiment was then determined on, and two miles having been payed out, the wire was allowed to rest for a few minutes, to make sure that the splice went down as far as the length of the cable would let it. A telegraphic message was then conveyed to the *Niagara* to commence hauling up, and both donkey engines were set in motion simultaneously. The enormous weight of the amount of cable out, and its friction on the water equally balanced the power of the *Agamemnon's* donkey engine, and it was only by the aid of handspikes and crowbars that it was kept revolving at all, the strain being two tons five cwt. After about a quarter of a mile of the cable had been reeled in, the weight and friction were sufficiently reduced to give the engine the advantage, and the reeling continued steadily, at the rate of about one mile an hour. During the operation, however, an accident occurred, which brought the wire into contact with the hawser which connected the *Niagara* with the *Agamemnon*, and this was cut through. The *Niagara*, having nothing to hold her, soon drifted away from the *Agamemnon*, and, as a natural consequence parted her end of the cable about half a mile from the splice. The splice, however, was after a time recovered by the hauling gear on board the *Agamemnon*, and the results of its immersion in such extremely deep water were interesting. The frame was penetrated to the very centre by the salt water, from the enormous pressure to which it must have been subjected, which it was calculated could not have been less than 8,000lbs. to the square inch. Both the wooden frame and the iron rod attached to it were considerably bent and twisted, and showed evident traces of having been turned round with considerable velocity while below the surface. The cable, within some twenty fathoms of the frame, was also much knocked and strained. Various other experiments were made, in the course of which the cable was subjected to very severe strains, which more than once caused it to part. The experiments are, however, stated to have been, on the whole, satisfactory, and though several slight alterations in the machinery and the general arrangements have suggested themselves to the engineers, the new paying-out machine is considered to have fulfilled the most sanguine expectations which were formed of it, only requiring a few trifling alterations in the mechanical adjustments.

SOUTH KENSINGTON MUSEUM.

During the week ending 5th June, 1858, the visitors have been as follows:—On Monday, Tuesday, and Saturday (free days), 2,774; on Monday and Tuesday (free evenings), 3,242. On the three Students' days (admission to the public 6d.), 763; one Students' evening, Wednesday, 96. Total, 6,875.

Proceedings of Institutions.

KANDY (CEYLON).—The committee of the Agri-Horticultural Society, in presenting their report for the year 1857, state that their attention has been much directed to the consideration of the important benefits that would result, not only to Ceylon, but to the home manufacturers, from an extended cultivation of cotton. It is certain that a very large extent of this island is well adapted for the growth of cotton, and there is little doubt that this article might, in some districts, be produced with profit to the cultivation. The Cotton Supply Association of Manchester has shown a readiness to assist in the

development of an extensive cotton production, having offered to place at the disposal of this Society ten pounds, as a prize to be given to the producer of ten bales, and upwards, of the best cleaned Kandy grown cotton, equal to American middlings in staple and quality; and a further sum of five pounds to the producer of not less than five bales of similar cotton. They have, moreover, promised to supply suitable seeds, and gins for cleaning the cotton, &c., and to send a number of copies of an excellent treatise, on the best mode of cultivating cotton known in the Southern States of America, and any other additional information it is in their power to communicate. The committee feel that the most effective stimulant to cotton cultivation on an extended scale, would be the giving facilities for the disposal, without much trouble or delay, and at a fair market price, of the cotton produced. To this they will direct the attention of the Cotton Supply Association, assuring them at the same time, that they will use their best endeavours to encourage the cultivation, and by the distribution of seeds, &c., to improve the quality of the article produced. Some apparently very good samples of cotton had been exhibited to the Society, and it was hoped that the producers would be able to supply it in sufficient quantity to enable judgment to be formed of its value. The attention of the committee had also been engaged in the consideration of the influence that forests have in keeping up a regular flow of water in streams taking their origin amongst them. A paper on this subject had been laid before the Society. The committee urge upon the members the desirableness of their obtaining, in their several districts, all the reliable information they can procure, as to whether the supply of water in the streams has been affected by the felling of the forests, and whether, and to what extent, the effect, if any, has been counteracted by the subsequent growth of the coffee trees. An interesting collection of dye woods had been exhibited at the last show. Vanillas, of excellent quality, had been sent from the Royal Botanical Gardens, and shown, as well as good samples of tobacco, and an extensive collection of gums, resins, and oils, which were considered of sufficient importance to be entitled to a gold medal. The committee think it desirable not to have an exhibition this year, unless it can be shown to them that a large number of persons are prepared to take some trouble to make it more generally attractive, by bringing fruits and flowers in sufficient number to produce a striking display. The committee trust that when the exhibitions of the Society are renewed, specimens of an improved breed of cattle and of other animals, &c., will be forthcoming, as this is too important a subject, in reference to the best interests of the island, to be neglected. The committee have no doubt that much attention will be shortly given to the subject of fibres, as the government has ordered from England two of Mr. Burke's machines for exhibition in the botanical gardens.

LONDON.—Mr. T. J. Pearsall has been appointed Corresponding Secretary of the London Mechanics' Institution. It is earnestly to be hoped that, with vigorous management within, and the support of its members and students without, a new career of usefulness may be opened for this, the parent Mechanics' Institution of the country, and that the friends of adult education will use every effort in furtherance of so desirable an object. On Wednesday, June 9th, Mr. T. A. Reed gave a lecture on "Speech and its Marvels." The lecturer pointed out the groups of sounds usually uttered to compose human language, and the distinct articulations required even for a single word, showing the wondrous anatomical powers called into requisition. He did not concur in the popular idea that children were a long time learning to speak. On the contrary, he could not but express his surprise that infants so soon mastered the difficulties of speech. Special attention was drawn to the great rapidity with which words could be enunciated, some fluent speakers even approaching the rate of 300 words per

minute. Mr. Reed, at a certain point, stated that up to that period, in one hour, more than 8,000 distinct articulations had been made to convey his meaning. The lecture was received with great attention by the audience.

SHEFFIELD.—The last report of the Church of England Educational Institute states that its progress during the past year has been most satisfactory. The highest number of names on the books in any quarter of the year 1856 was 152. In the first quarter of last year the number was 238; in the spring quarter it was 200; and in the winter now closing the number reached 251; a number unparalleled in the experience of this Society. The number of persons who have, during the past year, attended the classes is about 400. The students may be divided, with respect to regularity of attendance, into two portions: 1st, those who constantly attend and steadily apply; and 2nd, those who only come for one or two quarters, who, during that time, attend only one or two of the more entertaining classes, and who show, by their conduct in class, that they come for amusement rather than instruction. The latter portion of the students, undoubtedly, receive much benefit. They get a glimpse of higher subjects; become in some measure sensible of their own ignorance, and are altered at least, in outward demeanour and general taste. This, however, is not a promising class. It is to the regular, steady, hard-working student that the teacher looks for a display of the advantages of education. In him are gradually exhibited correctness of judgment, decision of purpose, habits of perseverance, elevation of morals, and enlargement of mind. It will thus be seen that a large number of irregular attendants is not a great advantage, but that the efficiency of such an Institution is chiefly to be measured by the number of constant attendants. The Committee have great pleasure in reporting that a very considerable portion of the students are of the latter satisfactory class. Nineteen years is, as it was last year, the average age of the students, while the immense majority continue to be composed of artisans. Several of the senior students have, during the last quarter, undertaken the tuition of junior classes, and the number of such teachers may be expected very considerably to increase. The society possesses the efficient assistance of many masters of the Church of England day schools, while at the same time the staff of teachers has been considerably recruited from other quarters. Many new classes have been formed, and in general efficiency the Institute has been much improved since the former year. New classes have been formed for the study of Trigonometry, of Roman and English History, and the French and Latin Languages; in these and other classes the books recommended by the Society of Arts are used as text-books. The library continues a source of much interest to the students, more than 2,700 volumes having been taken out during the year. The number of books in the library is steadily increasing, and the thanks of the members are due to the Sheffield Book Club for their very generous contributions. The financial position of the Society is equally encouraging with the rest of its proceedings. After discharging all necessary expenses, its annual income presents a most satisfactory surplus, and it is especially gratifying to know that this surplus is in a great measure due to the large increase in the contributions by students. In 1856 the increase of contributions from this source amounted to £32, while last year there was a further increase of £24. The erection of a new building for the purposes of the Institute has become absolutely necessary. The nightly attendance of students is so large, and the number of classes so great, that additional rooms are required for their accommodation. On account of the present inconvenient arrangements, the committee cannot invite first-class lecturers, nor afford the accommodation they could desire to the families of annual subscribers.

SLOUGH.—The last report of the Mechanics' Literary, and Scientific Institution, states that at the time of its

publication the Institution comprised 194 members. The resources of the Institution have steadily increased, both in the number of its members and the amount of its revenue. From purchases and donations, an addition of no less than 140 volumes had been made to the library during the year. The committee have much pleasure in reporting the continuance and progress of the drawing classes, under the kind and gratuitous superintendence of James Chapman, Esq., assisted by Mr. George Dorrell. The Hon. Secretary, Mr. G. Kershaw, voluntarily conducts the singing class upon the Hullah system, and his efforts appear to be thoroughly appreciated by the members. The Institution had been admitted into union with the Bucks and Berks Lecturers' Association, several of whose members would deliver lectures during the session.

MEETINGS FOR THE ENSUING WEEK.

- MON. Architects, 8. I. The Discussion on Mr. Burgess' Paper will be resumed. II. Mr. Wyatt Papworth, "Notes on the assumed use of Chestnut Timber in the Carpentry of Old Buildings."
Geographical, 8½. I. Messrs. Green, Hahn, and Rath, "Account of an Expedition from Damara Land to the Ovampo, in Search of the River Cunene." II. Lieut. C. A. C. De Crespigny, "Ascent of the River Limbong, Borneo." III. Mr. Thomas Hopkins, "On the Five Regions of the Trade Winds." IV. Mr. J. Turnbull Thomson, "Survey of the Southern Districts of Otago, New Zealand."
TUES. Statistical, 8. I. Mr. Welton, "On the Occupations of the People of England and Wales." II. Mr. Willich, "On the Population of England and France." III. Mr. Roberts, "Report on the Congrès de Bienfaisance at Frankfurt, 1857."
WED. Microscopical, 8.
THURS. Philosophical Club, 5½.
Antiquaries, 8.
Linnæan, 8.
Chemical, 8. Dr. Hofmann, "On Ammonia."
Philological, 8.
Royal, 8½.
SAT. Asiatic, 2.

PARLIAMENTARY REPORTS.

PRINTED SESSIONAL PAPERS.

- Parl. No. *Delivered on 22nd, 27th, and 28th May, 1858.*
94. Bills—Public Grounds and Playgrounds.
96. — Bishops' Trusts Substitution (No. 2).
Education—Minutes of the Committee of Council.
Sanitary Condition of the Army—Appendix 79.
Delivered on 29th and 31st May, 1858.
98 (A 3). Poor Rates and Pauperism—Return (A).
594. Royal Hibernian Academy—Return.
295. Navy (Seamen and Petty Officers)—Return.
296. New Zealand Loan—Return.
Delivered on 1st June, 1858.
276. Vessels and Tonnage, &c.—Return.
291. Poor Relief, &c. (Metropolis)—Return.
Delivered on 2nd June, 1858.
113. Harbours, &c. Bills (19. Clyde Navigation—Supplemental Report from the Board of Trade.
292. Army Clothing, &c.—Returns.
97. Bill—Bishops' Trust Substitution (No. 3).
Delivered on 3rd June, 1858.
270. Bleaching and Dyeing Works—Report from Committee.
297. Westminster New Palace—Copy of Further Correspondence.
302. East India (Letters and Collections, &c.)—Return.
303. East India (Civil Service Examinations)—Copy of Letter.
307. East India—Copy of Letter to the Governor-General.
Delivered on 4th June, 1858.
305. Printing—Copy of Treasury Minutes.
309. Ordnance Survey (Scotland)—Return.
98. Bills—Vaccination (Ireland).
99. — Drafts on Bankers' Law Amendment.
Public General Acts—Cap. 17, 18, 19, and 20.
Delivered on 5th and 7th June, 1858.
306. Reformatories—Return.
308. Gilbert-street Calamity—Return.
319. Contracts (Public Departments)—1st Report.
96. Bills (Titles to Land (Scotland)).
101. — Marriage Law Amendment (Amended).
102. — Nisi Prius Court (Ireland).
100. — Insurance Assurance Institutions.
107. — Law and Property Amendment.
Delivered on 8th June, 1858.
301. Army (Captain Grant's Kitchens)—Copies of Reports.

PATENT LAW AMENDMENT ACT.

APPLICATIONS FOR PATENTS AND PROTECTION ALLOWED.

[From Gazette, June 4, 1858.]

- Dated 15th March, 1858.*
524. W. G. Taylor, Ashby-de-la-Zouch, Leicestershire—Imp. in preparing skins for tanning.
- Dated 17th April, 1858.*
834. Grassay, Ivry, Rue du Chevalier, 7, Paris (Seine)—Hangings and all sorts of papers, made waterproof by a new process.
- Dated 24th April, 1858.*
906. J. Luis, 1n, Welbeck-street, Cavendish-square—A moderator piston. (A com.)
- Dated 30th April, 1858.*
964. B. L. A. Peaucellier, Paris, Boulevard Bonne Nouvelle, No. 10—An improved plough.
- Dated 5th May, 1858.*
1002. D. E. Hughes, New York—Imp. in the means of, and apparatus for, transmitting signals and electric currents.
- Dated 8th May, 1858.*
1036. A. V. Newton, 66, Chancery-lane—An improved manufacture of hard and waterproof fabric, and the application of the same to the construction of boats, parts of carriages, and of furniture, portmanteaus, and travelling cases, and vessels of capacity. (A com.)
- Dated 12th May, 1858.*
1062. J. Henderson, Glasgow—An improved apparatus for measuring fluids.
- Dated 17th May, 1858.*
1093. D. W. Hayden, 75, Pratt-street, Camden-town—Imp. in boilers for agricultural or domestic purposes.
1095. E. Tombs, 4, Waterloo terrace, Islington—Imp. in the manufacture of ruche and other trimmings for ladies' apparel, applicable also to making cap fronts and other fluted fabrics.
1097. W. H. Bagnall, Masbro', Yorkshire—Imp. in stove grates.
1099. C. W. Harrison, Woolwich—Imp. in obtaining light by electricity.
1101. H. Curzon, jun., Kidderminster—Imp. in preparing printed yarns.
1103. R. Ineary, Gateshead, and T. Richardson, Newcastle-on-Tyne—Imp. in roasting small or disintegrated pyrites.
- Dated 18th May, 1858.*
1105. J. Higgins, Oldham—Imp. in preventing explosions in mines, and in the machinery or apparatus employed therein.
1107. A. A. Croll, Coleman-street—Imp. in the treatment of sulphate of alumina, and in obtaining alum.
1109. S. Higgs, jun., Penzance, Cornwall—Imp. in miners' safety lamps.
- Dated 19th May, 1858.*
1111. J. Brown, Smithwick, Staffordshire—Imp. in the manufacture of iron, and in rolling iron and steel, and in machinery to be employed therein.
1113. W. Mac Naught, Manchester, and W. R. Critchley, Salford—Imp. in the manufacture of copper or other metallic rollers or cylinders for printing fabric, and in apparatus connected therewith.
1115. J. Bottomley and A. H. Martin, North Brierley, near Bradford—Imp. in means or apparatus employed in weaving.
1117. C. M. Kernot, M.D. Gloucester-house, West Cowes, Isle of Wight—Imp. in distilling shale, boghead, and other mineral matters.
1119. W. F. Snowden, Longford, Gloucestershire—An improved construction of chaff and litter cutting machine.
1121. M. Henry, 84, Fleet-street—Improved apparatus for communicating, or transmitting, or producing fac-simile copies of dispatches, intelligence, or messages, or characters, drawings, or devices. (A com.)
- Dated 20th April, 1858.*
1123. M. Brun, Vienne (France)—Imp. in dyeing.
1125. H. Brierley, Manchester—Imp. in mules for spinning.
1127. J. Boydell, 65, Gloucester-crescent, Camden-town—Imp. in machinery for propelling vessels.
- Dated 21st May, 1858.*
1129. T. Settle, Bolton le-Moors, Lancashire—Certain imp. in machinery or apparatus for preparing, slubbing, and roving cotton and other fibrous materials.
1131. F. C. Bakewell, 6, Haverstock-terrace, Hampstead—Imp. in machinery for making bolts. (A com.)
1133. J. Adamson, St. John-street-road—Imp. in the manufacture of parts of gas meters.
1135. J. Apperly and W. Clissold, Dudbridge—Improved machinery for condensing wool and other fibrous substances.
1137. J. Sholl, Victoria-grove West, Stoke Newington—Imp. in the manufacture of paper used for letter-press, lithographic, and copper-plate printing, and for other purposes.
- Dated 22nd May, 1858.*
1139. J. Elce and J. Champion, Manchester—Imp. in parts of machinery used in preparing and spinning cotton and other fibrous substances.
1141. J. Ronald, Liverpool—Imp. in dressing hemp, flax, and other fibrous materials.
1143. E. T. Hughes, 123, Chancery-lane—Imp. in machinery or apparatus serving the purposes both of saponification and of decomposing neutral fatty substances into fatty or oily acid and glycerine. (A com.)
1145. F. G. Underhay, Wells-street, Gray's inn-road, and J. L. Clark, Haverstock-hill, Hampstead—Imp. in cocks or taps, and in apparatus for flushing.
1147. J. H. Johnson, 47, Lincoln's inn-fields—Imp. in curtain rods. (A com.)
1149. A. P. Price, Margate—Imp. in the treatment of certain zinc ores and compounds of zinc, and in the manufacture of zinc and oxide of zinc.
1151. A. Ellissen, Throgmorton-street—Imp. in signalling in railway trains.
1153. G. F. Parke, Lower Smith-street, Clerkenwell, and J. Briant, Curtain-road—Imp. in bonnets.
- Dated 24th May, 1858.*
1155. R. L. Hattersley, Keighley, Yorkshire—Imp. in looms for weaving.
1157. M. Stevens, Holywell, Flintshire—Imp. in machinery for pulping straw and other vegetable fibres.
1159. W. Harding, Forest-hill, Kent—Imp. in revolver fire-arms.
- Dated 25th May, 1858.*
1161. Prince A. Gallitzin and S. Souschhoff, Paris, Boulevard de Strasbourg, 60, and F. E. Guérinot, Paris—An improved apparatus intended to prevent boats or ships to be destroyed and sunk when running full against each other.
1163. W. Webster, Washington, U.S.—Improved machinery for the propulsion of vessels.
1165. W. Webster, Washington, U.S.—An improved method of rigging vessels.
1167. C. F. Vasserot, 45, Essex-street, Strand—An improved construction of rails for fences and gates. (A com.)
1169. G. Alton and J. Fernie, Derby—An imp. in the construction of steam boilers and other vessels capable of resisting pressure, and in the manufacture of plates for the same.
1171. J. Courage, Horsleydown—Imp. in furnaces for smelting and calcining.
1173. R. C. Witty, Mitcham, Surrey—Imp. in protecting ships of war and land batteries and fortifications from injury from shot and other projectiles.
- Dated 26th May, 1858.*
1175. R. H. Nicholls, 42, St. Michael's-hill, Bristol—Imp. in taps or cocks for drawing off ale or other liquids.
1181. G. Cheadle, Wolverhampton—A new or improved flooring cramp.

WEEKLY LIST OF PATENTS SEALED.

- June 4th.*
3009. J. Rubery.
3012. J. Grizard.
3013. W. Standing.
3014. A. Morton and J. Howden.
3020. W. T. Henley.
3030. J. Harris.
June 5th.
3033. B. Shaw.
3038. W. J. Ward.
3041. E. A. Brooman.
3062. F. Walton.
3116. A. Lees and J. Clegg.
3154. A. W. Williamson.
3159. G. Croft and S. D. Steel.
3171. H. Deacon.
3174. H. Desmoutis.
14. J. Ellis and J. H. Ellis.
153. L. Caemmerer.
155. J. H. Johnson.
439. C. Boyce.
569. T. C. Medwin.
651. B. Burrows.
693. E. A. Colette.
731. R. Hornsby, junr.
760. T. Greenwood, J. Batley, and J. Dockray.
781. D. McCrae.
June 8th.
3046. J. Smith.
3047. J. Haddon.
3138. R. F. Sturges.
3140. S. Rodgett and D. Rodgett.
3149. C. N. Nixon.
59. N. E. Jeanroy.
84. W. Waller.
394. W. A. Gilbee.
413. A. V. Newton.
441. C. F. Vasserot.
747. G. W. Baker.
841. M. A. F. Mennons.
843. M. A. F. Mennons.
919. A. F. Emery.

PATENTS ON WHICH THE STAMP DUTY OF £50 HAS BEEN PAID.

- June 1st.*
1274. G. Green.
1279. W. Baines.
1413. U. Lane.
June 2nd.
1273. E. Morewood and G. Rogers.
June 3rd.
1268. P. A. Godefroy.
1272. W. Eley.
1300. J. Bunicle.
June 4th.
1292. G. Hopper.
1294. J. Robertson.
1343. H. W. Ford.
June 5th.
1295. H. Nunn.
1299. J. Ramsbottom.
1365. G. A. Biddell.

WEEKLY LIST OF DESIGNS FOR ARTICLES OF UTILITY REGISTERED.

No. in the Register.	Date of Registration.	Title.	Proprietors' Name.	Address.
4094 4095	June 4. ,, 2.	The Epaulette or Double-shouldered Shirt Instand	McIntyre, Hogg, and Co. M. Phineas	26, Adle-street, Wood-street, London. 42, Bold-street, Liverpool.